

### **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

The Office Action dated November 19, 2004 has been received and its contents carefully considered. Claims 1-20 are pending. Claims 1-20 have been rejected. Claims 1, 11, and 17 have been amended. Claims 21-24 have been added.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding rejections are respectfully requested in view of the following remarks.

### **CLAIM REJECTIONS – 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)**

Claims 1-5, 11-18, and 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being unpatentable by *Bowman-Amuah, et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6, 289,382 B1). Without conceding the propriety of the rejection, independent claims 1, 11 and 17 have been amended. It is respectfully submitted that *Bowman-Amuah, et al.* does not teach, *inter alia*, a method for accessing a Baan server comprising “sending data from a Visual Basic program to an application function server (AFS) of the Baan server... utilizing the AFS to communicate the data to at least one software object of the Baan server to generate at least one Baan session object... utilizing the Visual Basic program to communicate with the at least one Baan session object via the AFS” as recited in claim 1 and similarly in claims 11 and 17.

*Bowman-Amuah, et al.* disclosed a system, method, and article of manufacture provided for delivering service via a globally addressable interface. A plurality of interfaces are provided with access allowed to a plurality of different sets of services from each of the interfaces. However, *Bowman-Amuah, et al.* is silent with regards to teaching sending data from a Visual Basic program to an application function server of the Baan server, utilizing the application function server to communicate the data to at least one software object of the Baan server to

generate at least one Baan session object, and utilizing the Visual Basic program to communicate with the at least one Baan session object via the application function server as recited in claims 1, 11 and 17.

For anticipation under 35 U.S.C. §102 the reference must teach every aspect of the claimed invention either explicitly or impliedly. Any feature not directly taught must be inherently present (M.P.E.P. 706.02). Since each and every element, as set forth in the claim, is not found either expressly or inherently described as required by the M.P.E.P, *Bowman-Amuah, et al.* cannot be said to anticipate the invention as recited in claims 1, 11 and 17. Hence, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 2-5 depend ultimately from independent claim 1 and are patentable over the cited prior art for at least the same reasons as is claim 1.

Claims 12-16 depend ultimately from independent claim 11 and are patentable over the cited prior art for at least the same reasons as is claim 11.

Claims 18 and 20 depend from independent claim 17 and are patentable over the cited prior art for at least the same reasons as is claim 17.

#### **CLAIM REJECTIONS – 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)**

Claims 6-10 and 19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Bowman-Amuah, et al.* in view of *Rogers, et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6,405,111). Claims 6-10 depend ultimately from independent claim 1. Claim 19 depends from independent claim 17. *Bowman-Amuah, et al.* does not teach the invention as recited in claims 1 and 17 as outlined above. *Rogers, et al.* does not remedy the deficiencies of *Bowman-Amuah, et al.*, because it, too, does not teach sending data from a Visual Basic program to an application function server of the Baan server, utilizing the application function server to communicate the data to at least one

software object of the Baan server to generate at least one Baan session object, and utilizing the Visual Basic program to communicate with the at least Baan session object via the application function server as recited in claim 1 and similarly in claim 17.

In accordance with the M.P.E.P. §2143.03, to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness of a claimed invention, all the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art. *In re: Royka*, 490 F.2d 981, 180 USPQ 580 (CCPA 1974). “All words in a claim must be considered in judging the patentability of that claim against the prior art.” *In re: Wilson*, 424 F.2d 1382, 1385, 165 USPQ 494 196 (CCPA 1970). Therefore, since the prior art lacks all the claimed features, *Bowman-Amuah, et al.*, alone or in combination with *Rogers, et al.*, cannot be said to teach or suggest the present invention as recited in claims 6-10 and 19. Hence, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Newly added claims 21-24 depend ultimately from independent claim 1 and are patentable over the cited prior art for at least the same reasons as is claim 1.

Docket No. 87354.3161  
Application No. 09/904,503  
Customer No. 30734

Patent


**CONCLUSION**

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. If it is believed that the application is not in condition for allowance the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned attorney if it is believed that such contact will expedite the prosecution of the application.

**A check in the amount of \$200.00 is attached hereto for submission of new claims fees.** In the event this paper is not timely filed, Applicants petition for an appropriate extension of time. Please charge any fee deficiencies or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 50-2036.

Respectfully submitted,

BAKER & HOSTETLER LLP



Marc W. Butler  
Reg. No. 50,219

Date: February 22, 2005  
Washington Square, Suite 1100  
1050 Connecticut Avenue, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20036-5304  
Telephone: 202-861-1500  
Facsimile: 202-861-1783